

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO	). F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/411,143	-	10/04/1999	THOMAS C.K. YUEN	SRSLABS.257A	7907	
20995	7590	06/08/2005		EXAMINER		
KNOBBE	KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP			JACOBSON, TONY M		
	N STREET ENTH FLOO		·	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
IRVINE,	IRVINE, CA 92614		2644			

DATE MAILED: 06/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Application No. Applicant(s) 09/411,143 YUEN ET AL. Interview Summary Examiner Art Unit 2644 Tony M. Jacobson All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (3) John R. King. (1) Tony M. Jacobson. (2) Xu Mei. (4)\_\_\_\_\_. Date of Interview: 03 June 2005. Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_. Claim(s) discussed: 1....... Identification of prior art discussed: Iwamatsu (US 5,999,630), Short (US 4,739,514), Davies Rane (DC-24 User's Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: see below.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Discussed similarities and differences between short reference and bass enhancement aspect of Applicant's invention; also Davies teachings, and motivation to combine references. Particularly discussed embodiment of Applicant's Fig. 38 and claims 1, regarding multiplication of higher frequency signal by lower frequency signal. Did not reach any particular agreement.

SINH TRAN

EXPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

#### **Summary of Record of Interview Requirements**

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

#### Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by
  attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does
  not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,

(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)

- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

#### **Examiner to Check for Accuracy**

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

# Knobbe Martens Olson & Bear LLP

Intellectual Property Law

2040 Main Street Fourteenth Floor Irvine, CA 92614 Tel 949-760-0404 Fax 949-760-9502 www.kmob.com

# FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

#### CONFIRMATION COPY WILL FOLLOW VIA:

. 🖸	MAIL .	X	WILL NOT FOLLOW	
	INTERNATIONAL AIRMAIL		HAND DELIVERY	
	- 000.00.0	۵	WITH ENCLOSURES	
	E-MAIL	0	WITHOUT ENCLOSU	RES
	<u>Confidenti</u>	ality Not	tice:	
privileged. The in error, please	s accompanying this facsimile transmission information is intended only for the use of the immediately notify us by telephone to arring, distribution or the taking of any action	the recipient : mange for re	named below. If you have rec	eived this facsimile
To:	Examiner Tony Jacobson			
FIRM:	USPTO			
FACSIMILE No.:	(571) 273-7521			
OUR REF.:	SRSLABS.257A			
APP. No.:	09/411,143			
FROM:	John R. King		•	
OPERATOR:	Amy Durrant	1	No. Of Pages: 4	(incl. cover sheet)
DATE:	May 31, 2005			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	OT RECEIVE ALL OF THE PARTHONE NO.: (949) 760-0404		EASE CALL BACK FACSIMILE NO.: (94	
MESSAGE:			•	
1734167 053105			•	

PTOL-413A (09-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006, OMB 0851-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMPROP

Applicant Initiated Inte	rview Request	Form	
Application No.: 09/411,143 First Named Application First Named Application No.: 70/411,143 First Named Application No.: 70/411,143 First Named Application No.: 70/411,143	olicant: YUEN, Y Status of Ap	ET AL. plication: <u>P</u> e	ENDING
Tentative Participants: (1) John R. Kinb (2)		_	
(3)(4)			
Proposed Date of Interview: 6/8/05	Proposed T	ime: <i>[]:30</i>	(AM)PM)
Type of Interview Requested: (1) [ ] Telephonic (2) [4] Personal (3) [ ] Vi	ideo Conference		
Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: []YES If yes, provide brief description:	KYNO		
Issues To Be I	•		
Issues Claims/ (Rej., Obj., etc) Fig. #s Prior	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) SEE ATTACHED SHEET Art	. []	[]	[]
(2)	. []	[]	[]
(3)	. []	()	[]
(4) Continuation Sheet Attached	[ ]	[]	[ ]
Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:  SEE ATTACHED SHEET			
		<u> </u>	
An interview was conducted on the above-identified apparent. This form should be completed by applicant and sul (see MPEP § 713.01).  This application will not be delayed from issue because of application. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement as soon as possible.	bmitted to the examination by the sum of the	ner in advance : Ibmit a written	of the interview
Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature	Exam	iner/SPE Signa	itwe
Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative			
Registration Number, if applicable			

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or remin a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form analysr suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer. U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

SRSLABS.257A PATENT

# IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Yuen, et al.

Appl. No. : 09/411,143

Filed: October 4, 1999

For : ACOUSTIC CORRECTION

**APPARATUS** 

Examiner : Tony M. Jacobson

Group Art Unit : 2644

### PTOL-413A CONTINUATION SHEET

lssues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) 112 rejection	Claim 1/ Fig. 38	U.S. Patent No. 5,999,630 to lwamatsu (the "lwamatsu patent")	[ ]	[]	[ ]
(2) 103(a) rejection	Claim 1/ Fig. 38	U.S. Patent No. 4,739,514 to Short, et al. (the "Short patent")	[ ]	[]	[ ]
(3) 103(a) rejection	Claim 14/ Fig. 38	"Squeeze Me, Stretch Me: The DC 24 User's Guide" by Davies et al. ("the Davies publication")	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

## **Proposed Clarifications**

Applicant proposes amending Claim 1 to clarify that the bass enhancement module multiplies the amplitude of a higher-frequency signal with a lower-frequency signal to produce a signal envelope where the higher-frequency signal is modulated by the lower-frequency signal.

## **Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:**

An embodiment of Applicant's invention is directed to a system that comprises an image correction module, a bass enhancement module and an image enhancement module. In particular, the bass enhancement module multiplies the amplitude of a higher-frequency signal with a lower-frequency signal to produce a signal envelope where the higher-frequency signal is modulated by the lower-frequency signal.

Appl. No. : 09/411,143

Filed: October 4, 1999

Applicant agrees with the Examiner that the Iwamatsu patent does not disclose the claimed base enhancement module. Applicant, however, disagrees that the Short patent describes a base compressor that modulates the amplitude of a higher-frequency signal with a lower-frequency signal to enhance the perception of lower-frequency sounds to a listener.

Rather, the Short patent appears to describe a system where a 2:1 compressor is <u>added</u> to an original signal to improve automatic loudness compensation. The original signal is <u>not multiplied</u> with the output of the 2:1 compressor. Thus, the Short patent does not appear to describe the bass enhancement module that multiplies the amplitude of a higher-frequency signal with a lower-frequency signal to produce a signal envelope where the higher-frequency signal is modulated by the lower-frequency signal

1733700 052805